

United States Patent and Trademark Office

A4

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/831,449	08/13/2001	James Lucas	SEVR703STWP-US	4275	
37334 D'AMBROSIC	7590 08/07/2007 0. & ASSOCIATES P.L.1:	EXAMINER			
D'AMBROSIO & ASSOCIATES, P.L.L.C. 10260 WESTHEIMER			CHORBAJI, MONZER R		
SUITE 465 HOUSTON, T	X 77042	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1744		
			•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/831,449	LUCAS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MONZER R. CHORBAJI	1744	1

		MONZER R. CHORBAJI	1/44	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE RE	PLY FILED 26 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. ⊠ The this pla a F	e reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on a sapplication, applicant must timely file one of the followices the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, at tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	f Appeal. To avoid aba ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) 🛚 b) 🗌	The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
nave beer under 37 (set forth in may reduc	s of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date in filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later ce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origr than three months after the mailing date.	t of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
filir	e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp ng the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed MENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since
3.	ne proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a	nsideration and/or search (see NC ow); tter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally re	DTE below); educing or simplifying	
5. 🔲 Ap	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). the amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 oplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	21. See attached Notice of Non-Control of Non-Contr	·	
nor 7. Fo how The Cla Cla Cla	ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be an allowable claim(s). If purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) we the new or amended claims would be rejected is prose status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: aim(s) allowed: aim(s) objected to: aim(s) rejected: 48-65,68-70 and 81-89. aim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ w	-	
8. 🛭 The bed	/IT OR OTHER EVIDENCE a affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bucause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an snot earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	at before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
ent sho	e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing tered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
REQUES	ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER ne request for reconsideration has been considered bu		·	
12. 🔲 N	ee Continuation Sheet. ote the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ther:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	In An	N
			GLADYS JP CORC	ORAN

GLADYS JP COHCOHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Response to Arguments

On page 9 of the Remarks section, Applicant argues that the conventional term "waveguide" is understood to represent a structure that confines and guides electromagnetic waves, that in order to receive the microwaves and that Masaaki 32 structure is not connected to the microwave generator.

The ordinary meaning of a term is not limited to a one source (i.e., conventional knowledge), but is evidenced by various sources including the claims, the specification and others. See MPEP 2111.01 III. The specification as a whole provides two different meanings for a waveguide; either the one that giudes microwaves within it (figure 1:50 or 40) or the one through which microwaves penetrates (for example, figure 1:20). Applicant's claims is directed to the latter meaning. Moreover, Masaaki's waveguide (figure 3:32), guides microwave microwave generated at the microwave source (figure 4:21) through its walls (compare with figure 1:20 of the specification) by being UV transparent and wholly surrounding the UV lamp (figure 4:32 and page 11). Masaaki's waveguid (figure 4:32) is connected to the microwave generator (pages 7-9).

On pages 10-11 of the Remarks section, Applicant argues that Massaki specification does not term structure 32 as a waveguide and that Massak structure 32 is connected to flange 16a.

The examiner is not limited when evaluating a reference only to what inventors name such structures as long as other structures within the reference function as a waveguide and satisfies the limitation of a claim. The flange 16a in either of figures 3 or 2 functions to insure an airtight assembly (page 7) and has nothing to do with the fact that Massaki's waveguide (figure 3:32) is connected to the microwave generator (figure 3:21, 23, 24, 13, 32 and pages 7-9).